LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

FILED
AUG 16 1961
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1961

No. 112

JAMES JOSEPH CENAC,

Petitioner,

vs.

STATE BOARD OF LAW EXAMINERS OF ARKANSAS,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS

PETITIONER'S REPLY BRIEF

THURGMAN E. DIXON,
109-10 Glover Bldg.,
Little Rock, Arkansas,
Attorney for Petitioner.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1961

No. 112

JAMES JOSEPH CENAC,

Petitioner,

vs.

STATE BOARD OF LAW EXAMINERS OF ARKANSAS,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS

PETITIONER'S REPLY BRIEF

For the purpose of brevity this reply brief is in the form of a memorandum.

Respondents in their brief, page 2, claim that petitioner should have asked for a master to be appointed and a cost bond to be made pursuant to Rule 17 (c) of the lower Court. Petitioner again reiterates that the record in this case shows that the lower court had already decided the case and that no testimony of any kind had been taken as to actual grades made by petitioner on his examinations, nor as to his moral character. Petitioner stated in his Petition

For Writ Of Certiorari, page 13, "Under the circumstances it would be a vain thing to take testimony when, unmistakably the lower court has reached a decision without testimony being taken."

On pages 2 & 3 of Respondents brief it is stated that petitioner had perjured himself in almost all his applications to take the Bar Examination. Petitioner calls the Court's attention to pages 8 and 19 of the Petition For Writ of Certiorari, where it is pointed out that Respondents denied in their answer in the lower court any knowledge of Petitioner's moral character, same not having been considered. This charge of perjury has cropped up for the first time. Petitioner denies that he has ever perjured himself, respondent's statement being untrue. However, Respondents' statement certainly lends substance to Petitioner's allegation that he has been discriminated against due to personalities involved. On one hand Respondents deny any knowledge of Petitioner's Character and on the other hand they attack his character.

The writer of this brief does not care to lend dignity to the other remarks made by Respondents in their brief on page 3, but suffice it to say, the record in this case certainly shows their inconsistency. Such remarks on part of Respondents are wholly uncalled for and out of place.

In conclusion, Petitioner again prays that his petition for writ of certiorari be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

TILGHMAN E. DIXON,
109-10 Glover Bldg.,
Little Rock, Arkansas,
Attorney for Petitioner.